REMARKS

In response to the Office Action of August 10, 2005, Applicants have carefully considered the rejections of the Examiner in the above-identified application. In light of this consideration, Applicants believe that the claims as now amended are allowable. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of the claims now pending in the application.

In this first office action new drawings have been indicated as required. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 9, and 10 – 12, have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,112,203 to Bharat et al. (hereinafter Bharat) in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,886,129 to Raghavan et al. (hereinafter Raghavan). Claims 3, 5, 8, 10, 13, and 15, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bharat and Raghavan in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,633,868 to Min et al. (hereinafter Min).

New drawings have been indicated as required. Please find a new copy of the drawings filed concurrently herewith.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 9, and 10 – 12, have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bharat in further view of Raghavan. Bharat teaches that in a computerized method, a set of documents is ranked according to their content and their connectivity by using topic distillation. The documents include links that connect the documents to each other, either directly, or indirectly. A graph is constructed in a memory of a computer system. In the graph, nodes represent the documents, and directed edges represent the links. Based on the number of links connecting the various nodes, a subset of documents is selected to form a topic. A second subset of the documents is chosen based on the number of directed edges connecting the nodes. Nodes in the second subset are compared with the topic to determine similarity to the topic, and a relevance weight is correspondingly assigned to each node. Nodes in the second subset having a relevance weight less than a predetermined threshold are

pruned from the graph. The documents represented by the remaining nodes in the graph are ranked by connectivity based ranking scheme.

Bharat is concerned with solving the problem of answering a search engine query, and thus with ranking a set of documents to point to in response to that query. The Applicants however are teaching that once a potential document page is identified, how to pull together the content found in a particular hyperlinked document so identified into *a document representation.* A document representation suitable for subsequent printing and downloaded viewing. As such the Applicants teach "to weed out links which have properties that are not characteristic of typical *intra-document* links" and thus eschew all other documents. Nor does Bharat teach identifying possible "table of content" links.

As Bharat fails to teach each and every element of the Applicants' claim as explained above, it cannot stand and satisfy a Prima Facie case of obviousness. Raghavan in turn fails to provide what Bharat lacks, and thus the combination of Bharat and Raghavan fails to provide the requirements for a Prima Facie case of obviousness and thus the rejection is improper. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims as now amended.

Claims 3, 5, 8, 10, 13, and 15, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bharat and Raghavan in view of Min. The combination of Bharat and Raghavan fails to provide the requirements for a Prima Facie case of obviousness asnoted above. Min in turn fails to provide what Bharat and Raghavan lack, and thus the combination of Bharat, Raghavan, and Min also fails to provide the requirements for a Prima Facie case of obviousness and thus the rejection is improper. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims as now amended.

No additional fee is believed to be required for this amendment; however, the undersigned Xerox Corporation attorney authorizes the charging of any necessary fees, other than the issue fee, to Xerox Corporation Deposit Account No. 24-0025.

In the event the Examiner considers personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, he is hereby requested to call the undersigned attorney at (585) 423-6918, Rochester, NY.

Respectfully submitted,

Christopher D. Wait
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 43,230
Telephone (585) 423-6918

December 12, 2005
CDW/fsl
Xerox Corporation
Xerox Square 20A
Rochester, New York 14644